SEXUALITY
An Unconventional View

Date: May, 2026.
Words: 5,265

Since I am proposing an unconventional view, in contrast to the traditional view, I present an outline of the philosophical background to my thinking for the benefit of the reader. Without question my view has been influenced by a modern understanding of the scientific method. I have concluded that within contemporary philosophy the modern scientific method is an ethical, if not a religious methodology since it is undertaken by human beings. Modern science presents the more reliable and accurate type of knowledge to date which I hold to be tantamount to human virtue, hence its method is a type of religious activity.

Given this understanding revealed religion cannot maintain its exclusive claim to the truth. Nor can scientific understanding satisfactorily address, without qualification, the perceived religious needs of humanity. In short, religious feeling and objective reason need to be harmonized. Modern science is the least anthropomorphic way of humanity identifying its nature and its place within the universe. Science identifies humanity as the highest active value in the universe whose self-reflection is the end and understanding of human knowledge thus replacing God as the primary philosophical focus of human understanding. This shift to a scientific focus has become the new means by which humanity can appropriately identify itself with divinity. Modern scientific methodology is tantamount to a new philosophical gnosticism. Following Leslie Dewart's perspective, I suggest that the scientific method is "best characterized as a gnosticism, since by its very nature it proclaims that the deliverance and salvation of man lie only in knowledge."[1]

My unconventional perspective presumes that metaphysics alone conceived as a dogmatic, non-empirical but rationalist philosophy, does not give reliable knowledge. Modern science gives reliable knowledge, but it is a limited knowledge since it describes only facts. That is, it addresses the "how" of experience, but not the possibility of a higher motivation, the "why" inherent in the human intellect. Modern science is important not merely for its own sake but for ethical and moral consequences of social behaviour especially in light of contemporary sexual activity.

A new theory of sex has been proposed and advanced in recent years by Western theologians of which Anthony Kosnik's, *et al*, *Human Sexuality: New Directions in American Catholic Thought*[2] is an example. Within this context a non-Catholic author George Grant commented: "The Roman Catholic Church is in a different position from that of any other ecclesiastical body, because of its systematic encouragement of philosophical study among its members. Within its fold, the corpus of tradition is being brought continually before the court of

---

[1] From the Abstract, *The Development of Karl Pearson's Scientific Philosophy,* Dewart's PhD thesis, University of Toronto (1954).

[2] Kosnik, Anthony; Carroll, William; Cunningham, Agnes; Modras, Ronald; Schulte, James (1977). *Human Sexuality: New Directions in American Catholic Thought. A Study Commissioned by The Catholic Theological Society of America*. Paulist Press.

definition in a way which allows the possibility of a dynamic restatement arising in its midst."[3] But despite the Catholic Church's tradition being called before the "court of definition" no satisfactory corresponding theory of sexuality has resulted in meeting modern technodigital scientific discoveries. Non-Catholic churches with less dependence upon the scholastic tradition are taking the lead in this area of technological theological thinking.

What is genuine in theological and philosophical investigation often proves to be less than what has been supposed. That is, one truth may be perceived to be narrower than another. While the Hellenic inspired view of philosophy may be conceived as narrow when viewed in comparison to contemporary scientific approaches, Leslie Dewart has observed that: "The phenomenological method, then, is not the diametric opposite of the ontological; it is a more comprehensive one than the latter, whose merits it preserves and whose inadequacies it tries to remedy."[4] The phenomenological method is foundational to this essay. The Hellenistic view of reality is foundational to the classical (objectivist) Western conception of philosophy, whereas phenomenological interpretation of reality further incorporates a subjective understanding of reality. The advantage of a subjective view of reality is that it includes the observer within the interpretation of reality. This self-inclusive view constitutes a new "objective" philosophical perspective wherein the observer is part of the observed. Thus, in phenomenology, humanity has objectified itself for study.

Homo sapiens have evolved out of a world to which they must return in some manner. Thus, some understanding of this world is needed. Hellenist philosophers consider humanity as a rational animal. However, outside the narrow world of Athenian philosophy, other viewpoints were held as well, such as Stoicism, Epicureanism, skepticism and solipsism. In ancient Greece the Olympic pantheon and the chthonic deities were a stable part of the culture. "The Olympic pantheon contained the rational sky gods, the chthonic deities were irrational or emotional earth gods."[5] The Greek philosophers experienced the human passions of sexuality within their own hearts as discreetly expressed by Dickinson:

> The powers of nature were not the only ones felt by man to be different from and alien to himself; there were others, equally strange, dwelling in his own heart, which, though in a sense they were part of him, yet he felt to be not himself, which came upon him and possessed him without his choice and against his will. With these, too, he felt the need to make himself at home, and these, too, to satisfy his need, he shaped into creatures like himself.[6]

Today, sexuality as numbered among the passions may be comprehended within human scientific knowledge. Thus, the theological significance of humanity's sexual values arises in importance in relation to divine revelation within a contemporary Western context. Yet, "living a sex life somehow does not seem to fit into living the divine life fully."[7] That is to say, what

---

[3] Grant, George (1995: 127, n. 2). *Philosophy in the Mass Age.* University of Toronto Press.

[4] Dewart, Leslie (1989: 31). *Evolution and Consciousness: The Role of Speech in the Origin and Development of Human Nature*. University of Toronto Press.

[5] Feibleman K. James (1970: 26). *The New Materialism*. Martinus Nijhoff.

[6] Dickinson, G. Lowes (1932: 8). *The Greek View of Life*. Methuen & Co.

[7] Kosnik (1977: 29). *Human Sexuality*.

are the possible effects on the knowing subject's experience of human sexuality brought about by scientific inquiry? Such observable patterns of behaviour are the focus of the philosopher's attention. Since these patterns of behaviour include the philosopher's own reactions to sexual experience when taking into account the established methods of investigative philosophical inquiry; new patterns of understanding are likely to arise within a phenomenological philosophical understanding. In fact,

> What is distinctive about phenomenology may be formulated abstractly from its concrete practice. It has shown itself to be progressively primordial reflection, Specifically, it has been:
> 1. the articulation of the *correlative* structures of objectivity and subjectivity;
> 2. the evincement of *foundational* objectivity and subjectivity; and
> 3. the circumspection of the *primordial unity* out of which objectivity and subjectivity differentiate.[8]

The experiences of human homosexuality give rise to an understanding of a "queer" human nature presenting a new object for inquiry in theology. Within phenomenological philosophy there is no recognition of an inherited "divine plan" for all humanity. Rather, phenomenological philosophy is undertaken within a queer consciousness that challenges the individual to reinterpret its existential experience without using traditional formulae. However, I do not propose phenomenology as the sole philosophy for the interpretation of human experience in general, but only to propose an acceptable alternative to classical philosophy for the person who desires to act morally and religiously in particular situations of queer experience. In short, phenomenology is a philosophical tool appropriate for use in addressing queer issues within the community, which, at the same time, may be helpful to "straight" thinkers in understanding human sexuality.

One aspect of civilized culture has always been the proper interaction within human sexual relationships. Cultivated humanity originates with *homo sapiens.* Understanding their particular sexual habits constrains philosophers to work within certain cultural limitations. Cultures give rise to particular philosophical theories of human reality among which was the theory of rational humanity. A dominant theory of reality is contemporary social theory arising out of a Western philosophical perspective. The physical world was there before humanity and will likely remain long after humanity has vanished presuming a negative process of physical evolution within a greater cosmological scheme. That is to say that humanity is not necessary to the evolution of the cosmos. Within humanity's existential situation, Daniel Guerrière, wrote that Karl Marx believed that the purpose of social reform, which may be seen as one contribution to the process of human evolution, was to change the world. Grant further observed:

> As Marx wrote: 'The philosophers up to now have been concerned with understanding the world; we are concerned with changing it.' What he means is that the philosophers have sought the meaning already present. They have sought God. He is not concerned with the meaning already present, he is concerned with the

[8] Guerrière, Daniel (1990: 1). *Phenomenology of the Truth Proper to Religion*. State University of New York Press [Author's italics].

> creation of meaning in the future by man. He is concerned with the practical overcoming of the suffering he sees all around him. Therefore, man must take his fate into his own hands and to do that he must overcome the idea of God.[9]

In addition, Cox explained that

> this is why Marx was so impatient with intellectuals who wanted to argue or persuade people out of their political ideas or religious beliefs. People's opinions, Marx believed, could be changed by altering the social reality on which they were based. He was tired of those philosophers who had spent their lives interpreting the world. 'The time has come,' he said, 'to change it.'[10]

A new understanding of sexuality may change the world in ways favourable to human social life. However, it is to be noted that individually humans envision themselves poorly and not nearly as well as others see them. The philosophy implicit in the interpretation of human sexuality is never totally subjective, nor objective. Yet, unlike in Marx, in matters sexual the problem is not to overcome God, but rather the opposite, that is, to integrate God into the human understanding of sexuality.

Humanity has made the philosophical and psychological discovery of a human interior life which is the source of piety resulting in an emphasis being put on consciousness and human values. This insight follows upon the human mind's recognition of itself and its own thought processes. But the mind's recognition of itself as being self-conscious of human values is not a new idea. With reference to Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, XII, 7, Dewart notes:

> In this text Aristotle explains why the human mind finds it possible to understand itself despite the fact that it cannot experience itself from the outside, as it can external objects. But Aristotle's explanation is that the human mind does indeed understand itself by becoming, in a way, its own object. Since the mind is nothing but the ability to experience, he argues, it is clear that, if it could understand how it experiences objects, it would understand itself.[11]

How then is one to recognize the uniqueness of human sexuality when the norms of the macrocosm and microcosm are studied by scientists? Can there be a comprehensive philosophy that satisfies the aspects of the macrocosm and of the microcosm of human reality? There may be one such philosophy but it must be recognized that it suffers from the limitations of the subjective predicament. The human subject is equipped to deal with the total environment, not simply one physical part of it. That is, the human self can experience its own inner spiritual activity. This means that human subjects can learn the truth about their place in the world and no longer need to rely on myth and legend for answers. In other words humanity is capable of conceiving the non-particularized truth of consciousness. That is to say, understanding the fact *that* something is; yet not *what* it is. By this means an individual can elevate itself spiritually

---

[9] Grant (1995: 52). *Philosophy in the Mass Age*.

[10] Cox, Harvey (1967: 104). *The Secular City*. *Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective*. MacMillan.

[11] Dewart (1989: 48 n. 18) *Evolution and Consciousness.*

without lowering the materiality of the world. Given this context, the implications for a new understanding of human sexuality are obvious. Matter no longer needs to be viewed as evil and spirit as the sole good.

To think in a new key is an exercise in existential philosophical consciousness. Through existential consciousness we gain more information about the world and ourselves than our senses alone can provide. I am not concerned here *how* we gain more information, but *that* we gain more information. We are born into a "life already in progress" without knowing the mechanics of the origin of life itself. The mechanics of the origin of life itself must be left to speculative thought. Thus, philosophizing in a new key begins existentially and critically in thinking about our life that is already in progress, and not speculating about the unknown origins of life. It is this existential and critical thinking as a point of departure that puts our thought process in a new key, and in fact creates a "stream of consciousness" which defines our human specificity.

The world and all it contains, including its mystery, need not be intelligible in itself for us to understand it. It can be experienced as chaotic and we can still theologize consciously about the mystery of God from a human point of view. This is something mere animal consciousness cannot achieve. When theologians contemplate a mystery, from a theological point of view, this does not change the mystery itself, but only makes a difference to the interpretation of it. We learn from our experience of the mystery and re-arrange our life accordingly. When this is done consciously the mystery is experienced as somehow "other-than-us." Thus critical theological understanding begins in philosophy. Contemporary theology is thus rooted in philosophy since when philosophers contemplate a puzzle, their contemplation leads to some form of theology.

I grant that existential philosophy, itself and alone, gives no reason to believe that human nature is destined to ascend to a higher plane of understanding than the human intellect can provide. That is to say, philosophy is not revelation. Such assent belongs to the experience of faith. However, philosophy arising from the human intellect does query the current success of the sciences in their interpretation of human nature. The sciences are purely secular activities and no theological transcendence is required in their interpretation. What Harvey Cox says concerning the organization in secular society I think is true of philosophy also. That is that secular philosophical organization of ideas "offers many more possibilities for choice and creativity than were available in the age of the sacral order."[12] Philosophy has its own method and it is not the method of science. The arts and sciences are cultural activities, but they do not, of themselves, incorporate the totality of reality. Nor do they exhaust the horizons of sexuality. But one must distinguish between popular culture and professional philosophy and realize that Western popular culture is becoming more professional in its outlook.

Professional philosophy appears more as a mosaic than as a hierarchical ranking of preferred opinion. But it is likely that hierarchies will appear within individual cultures constituting a philosophical mosaic. The perspective of this essay is an American one which reflects the expanding horizon of sexual understanding in the mosaic of mass culture. When it come to religious values, European and American cultures reflect different approaches in understanding secular values which in turn affect their understanding of sexuality. "What they [Europeans]

[12] Cox (1967: 152). *The Secular City.*

misunderstood is that the progressive secularism that holds our society is not identical with the secularism of Europe because it has in large measure arisen out of the ashes of a multiform Protestantism, particularly Puritanism."[13] As Kosnik, *et al* have noted: "We are convinced that there can be no genuine theological development that does not flow from the past."[14] However, to be acknowledged in the American context is the fact that popular philosophy and scientific understanding often direct mass attention away from any explicit and critical theology in the general comprehension of human nature or sexuality.

Scientists work out the consequences of their discoveries, whereas philosophers interpret that which has been proposed to them, in this case, human sexual values. When it comes to defending a coherent approach to sexual values, today we know more about sexuality than our pre-scientific forefathers. Even so what exists objectively exceeds individual human subjective comprehension as experience shows. Once, the phenomenon of human sexuality was not held to be a complex experience. Today, the phenomenon of human sexual experience is far from simple as the increasing number of debates over gender, women's and LGBTQ+ issues indicate. There was always an unknown aspect to human sexuality given its many subdivisions such as homosexuality which seemed to defy philosophical explanation or at least appear somewhat deficient. In classical philosophy, "the good" is characterized by a notion of completeness uniting opposites and over-coming deficiencies. Concerning any detrimental aspect of homosexuality needing to be overcome, Kosnik *et al* state:

> Some philosophical anthropologists question whether any preference should be given to either heterosexual or homosexual orientation. In their view, human beings rise above their biological givens and are free to choose the sexual expression they prefer. They have the potential of integrating any form of expression into their total human project. The only thing 'natural' for a person is to embrace life in freedom. Masters and Johnson in their recently published findings on the subject of homosexuality indicated that they are persuaded that homosexuality is an acceptable and satisfying expression.[15]

The understanding of human sexuality might have progressed more quickly had it not been for religious institutional dogmas which precluded further investigation given that their understanding of sexuality was complete. But with the advent of modern science such dogmatism could not be maintained. Theories of human sexuality are not facts about human sexuality. However, the arts and sciences of Western civilization have laid new foundations for the understanding of human sexuality today. All civilization is artificial and it follows that human sexuality will likely continue to reflect an evolutionary adaptation to this artificial environment in contradistinction to a "natural" environment. However, evolutionary adaptations are likely to be localized according to cultre. In George Grant's words: "This sense of crisis arises above all from the fact that the doctrine of natural law no longer holds the minds of most modern men, and no alternative theory has its universal power."[16] One might argue that humanity is learning to design its sexual preferences, but at the same time does not seem to

---

[13] Grant (1995: 76). *Philosophy in the Mass Age.*

[14] Kosnik (1977: xii). *Human Sexuality.*

[15] Kosnik (1977: 59). *Human Sexuality.*

[16] Grant (1995: 26). *Philosophy in the Mass Age.*

understand or manage them from any universal cultural perspective. This is a significant observation for cultural studies since human culture is but the rearrangement of the evolutionary environment of *homo sapiens*.

While sexual needs are animal needs,[17] satisfied human sexual needs retain an innate "drive" long after they have been satisfied. Of course, this drive is age an appropriate phenomenon appearing and disappearing in the life of the individual human organism. It may be stated in this manner: individual needs are physiological, individual drives are psychological and their combination results in the sexual artifacts of a culture. However, there is such a variety of sexual experience available throughout global cultures that any one individual cannot experience them all. A choice must be made and the individual, as a dynamic organism, reveals a sexual preference that transcends standardization within a society. Customs, laws, legal processes, statutes, ordinances and court decisions have contributed to the sexual ethics and morality of any given culture. Ethics and morality arise from the integration of human societal behaviour. The difficulty with sexual integration is that humanity is expected to manage its sexual needs under conditions that have evolved to something quite different than when *homo sapiens* first appeared on earth. Since then humanity has evolved a social conscience concerning its understanding of sexuality. As Kosnik *et al* note: "if any absolutely detrimental sexual behavior could be identified, the finding would be extremely helpful in developing a code of sexual ethics free of relativity."[18] In the general context of Queer Studies, it is theologically significant that whereas human beings are obviously culturally programmed, they can also consciously re-write their cultural programmes. Philosophy being understood in a new key of consciousness, that is, existentially allows human activity to concentrate on doing something, rather than simply being something.

Our human world does not merely function around random events happening without purpose. There is assigned purpose to our political, economic, religious and social construction of life. The primary purpose is based on our needs. The secondary purpose is based on our wants. The conscious construction of queerness is a product of the ethical and moral choices we make in our day to day lives. Our contemporary consciousness of queerness is to be understood in contrast to the traditional Western consciousness of heterosexuality which has been inordinately influenced by Hellenistic or Ancient Greek philosophical thought. The notion of queerness has recently come into vogue in Western society and consciously exposed certain prevailing views to criticism. In Katherine Johnson's words, "the explosion of queer studies entailed asking new types of questions, or finding a new place to begin."[19] Since it asks new types of questions, queer consciousness is better understood today through phenomenological philosophy, than classical philosophy, due to the philosophical combination of theory and activism.

> Thus, as queer theory and activism has evolved, arguing for the legitimacy of marginalized subjects and practices … while resisting the delineation of its field of application, it has paid increasing attention to the way other categories of difference

[17] Kosnik, *et al* (1977: 61) note that "animal behavior is less relevant to those who see sexuality as a radically different phenomenon since it functions within the structure of human subjectivity."
[18] Kosnik (1977: 56). *Human Sexuality.*
[19] Johnson, Katherine (2015:87). *Sexuality: A Psychosocial Manifesto.* Polity.

> intersect within an overarching commitment to a non-normative and anti-identity stance.[20]

A queer consciousness arises within the experience of human sexuality and often in a religious context which may be negative or positive. Currently, the Christian moral and ethical principles that formerly held religious life together often seem to be disintegrating as traditional philosophical supports of western belief are undermined. Ethical and moral principles need to be adapted to a new philosophy in order to hold one's future civilized belief system together. But as Werner Heisenberg notes this will not be an easy task.

> We cannot close our eyes to the fact that a great majority of the people can scarcely have any well-founded judgment concerning the correctness of certain important general ideas or doctrines. Therefore, the word 'belief' can for this majority not mean 'perceiving the truth of something' but can only be understood as 'taking this as the basis for life.' One can easily understand that this second kind of belief is much firmer, is much more fixed than the first one, that it can persist even against immediate contradicting experience and can therefore not be shaken by added scientific knowledge. The history of the past two decades has shown by many examples that this second kind of belief can sometimes be upheld to a point where it seems completely absurd, and that it then ends only with the death of the believer.[21]

Humanity has developed particular skills and techniques for altering the external and internal world of its organism which include planning sexual activity. The subjective nature of human sexuality is reflected in the external relations between persons and is realized in the cultural artifacts of human agency. Sexual activity is not a question of the quality of human nature, but of the complexity of human nature; especially in light of the contributions of techno-digital scientific information and production. One's present sexual responses may be altered by earlier sexual experiences thus placing the individual in a position of constructing a new vision of human sexuality. In short, it is a matter of cultural conditioning. In Feibleman's words: "The individual who comes of age in a culture has also learned to consider it with all its artificial structures and customs as the only natural set of conditions for man."[22] And culture influences the choice of sexuality that the individual makes. But as Kosnik's study has noted: "Specific culturally conditioned instructions cannot claim validity for all time."[23] In this context philosophers need to ask more questions concerning human sexuality and make fewer assertions about human sexuality. It is worth noting that history tends to show that in most cases the positive effects of cultural influence are individual; whereas, the negative effects of cultural influence are social.

Many people are unclear about the difference between the activity of sexuality and one's sexual identity. They believe that the activity of sexuality creates the identity of sexuality. They therefore assume that "queerness" is possible, and they are inspired to "create," or identify it in

---

[20] Johnson (2015: 92). *Sexuality.*

[21] Werner Heisenberg (1962: 204). *Politics and Philosophy: Revolution in Modern Science.* Harper Torchbooks.

[22] Feibleman (1970: 135). *New Materialism.*

[23] Kosnik (1977: 7). *Human Sexuality.*

an individual. Ironically, the point is that, since such people know no better, their ignorance facilitates their success in naming, i.e., queering individuals. For instance, they scrutinize the human sciences, both the hard and soft sciences, in order to discover particular identities not previously in the individual consciousness of the person or the collective consciousness of society.

Should these individuals take into account the objective role of the sciences they would realize that the dynamic for producing a queer identity is a self-oriented and causal process — in other words "queering" is a process that is proper to philosophy and not proper to technological sciences. The sciences, as such, cannot create or name anyone's identity, only clarify the object of one's understanding. However, the unawareness of the situation gives them a paradoxical advantage. Queer identity, mistakenly conceived, is the kind of notion that can be consciously recognized and subsequently accepted socially as "fact" even when it is merely a psychological fiction. In other words, sociologists have rendered the notion of homosexuality as a concrete social "fact" in opposition to heterosexuality as a concrete social "fact," when the only fact is that humans are biological sexual beings.

In the final analysis the social sciences do not create a true counterpart to traditional heterosexual identity. They do, however, support an illusion, or psychological fiction (a type of ideology) in the public forum that has the power to bring about social change — whether positive or negative has yet to be determined. Now, why is queerness identified as a social reality? For what ends should it exist? These questions are not likely to be adequately answered by social scientists. Nor are they likely to be answered satisfactorily by philosophers who are eager to promote the acceptance of such a social scientific ideology. Could it be the case that the artificially conceived need of an independent queer ideology is due to an inadequate philosophical anthropology of human sexuality?

CONCLUSION

Humans need an understanding of sexuality that takes into consideration the philosophical probability that there is a divinity given the tentative evidence for the existential uniqueness of humanity and the acceptance of toleration and fallibility. There is need for an understanding of sexuality without dogmatic institutionalization. The present understanding of clinical homosexuality is likely an emotional, as opposed to reasonable, admission that humanity had previously possessed "false knowledge." In the human context, a healthy psychic understanding of sexuality requires that contradictory interpretations of experience are not to be maintained which are incapable of resolution. Every mature and healthy individual is capable of determining the subjective core values of his or her personality which determine the existential borders of the human being.

Knowing the borders of oneself vis-à-vis the world requires information about oneself and the world. Rovelli cautions that "knowledge is intrinsically relational; it depends just as much on its object as upon its subject."[24] This is not the perspective of classical physics which conceived reality as existing independently of the observer. In short, contemporary existential philosophy

[24] Rovelli, Carlo (2016: 223). *Reality is not What it seems: The Journey to Quantum Gravity*. Penguin.

conceives information as dynamic knowledge, not static knowledge. Therefore, progress in sexual understanding must continue along this line. A static understanding of sexuality is a dead understanding of sexuality. There is no advancement in a world in which it is better to be ignorant than knowledgeable. Theoretically, for humanity there is no limit to experience, nor set boundaries to individual insight. Thus, what may be God-like about humanity is an unlimited horizon. Further, the arts, sciences and philosophy may be envisioned as incorporating authentic sexual human pursuits given that they constitute efforts to put human sexual experience into some proper order. But there is a caveat. Proper order means that the cultural and political affairs of this world ought to gain no advantage from, nor exploit human sexuality. Feibleman's mid-20th century observation marks a philosophical turning point for understanding human sexuality within an existential context. There is a new understanding of matter he maintained. "If matter in the old sense is gone, so is the concept of spirit, which lived largely on its opposition to matter."[25] What does this mean for the understanding of any spirituality for human sexuality?

The cultural institutionalization of sexuality in the West divorced sex from the spirituality of human nature. Cultural institutionalization results from a misreading of the forces at work within human nature. Sexual interpretation is a not merely a way of looking at a biological experience. Sexual interpretation is a philosophical and theological way of looking at humanity. Sexual activity is one of the two animal aspects that humanity has inherited from its hominid ancestors. The other is aggression. Both are managed poorly as history demonstrates. In light of modern techno-digital experience an altered sexuality may be an institutionalized attempt to add, for good or ill, to the variety of human social experience. A final word in this essay goes to a pious scientist. "We must learn how to find our own way toward the good, and this way, too is from God. Of late we have begun to discern some guide lines to help us: logic and mathematics, and the experimental sciences, which have come to the aid of art and philosophy."[26] Significantly, in North America it took until 1977 when Catholic thinking began to acknowledge the contribution of scientific insight to traditional thinking on sexuality.

> From St. Paul through St. Thomas Aquinas to our own day and the 1975 Vatican Declaration on Sexual Ethics, Catholic tradition has constantly judged all homosexual acts as against nature and hence gravely sinful. Underlying this tradition are not only a pre-scientific physiology and unhistorical interpretation of Scripture but also the Stoic conviction that procreation alone justifies the enjoyment and use of sexual pleasure. Even in Catholic circles this Stoic principle no longer goes without question. Scientific research and recent discoveries in medicine and psychology have brought to light the need to modify traditional preconceptions on a number of counts.[27]

[25] Feibleman, James (1958: 70). *The Pious Scientist: Nature, God and Man in Religion*. Bookman Associates.

[26] Feibleman (1958: 109). *The Pious Scientist.*

[27] Kosnik (1977: 199). *Human Sexuality.*